

REMARKS

Claims 14, 34-38, 40 and 41 are pending in this application, with claims 14 and 36-38 being independent. Claims 1-13, 15-33 and 39 have been canceled. Claims 40 and 41 have been added. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claim 14 and claim 34 (which depends from claim 14) were rejected as being unpatentable over Fujimura. However, Fujimura does not describe or suggest providing a scribing line formed on the resin, as recited in amended claim 14. For at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 35-39 were rejected as being unpatentable over Fujimura in view of Yasutake, U.S. Patent No. 4,094,058.

With respect to claim 35, which depends from claim 14, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Yasutake does not remedy the failure of Fujimura to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 14.

With respect to claim 36, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Fujimura, Yasutake, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests scribing joined element and opposing substrates to form a plurality of liquid crystal display devices such that each of the liquid crystal display devices has a part of the hole portion in a corner of the liquid crystal display device, as recited in claim 36. As noted by the Examiner, Fujimura does not describe or suggest scribing. Recognizing this, the Examiner points to Yasutake as reciting holes 37 and 38 in the corners of liquid crystal display devices and argues that it would have been obvious to employ scribing and Yasutake's holes in the system of Fujimura in order to reduce costs. However, even assuming for sake of argument that it would be appropriate to combine Fujimura and Yasutake in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the resulting combination still would not include parts of the hole portions in corners of the liquid crystal display devices. Rather, as shown by Fig. 10 of Yasutake, each device would include its own hole portions 37 and 38. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 36 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 37, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Fujimura, Yasutake, nor any combination of the two describes or

suggests scribing the joined element and opposing substrates after injecting the liquid crystal material. While the Examiner indicates that a recitation to this effect may be found in Yasutake, applicant has been unable to find one. Accordingly, should the Examiner choose to maintain this rejection, applicant asks that the Examiner identify with specificity the portion of Yasutake that is believed to include this recitation.

With respect to claim 38, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Fujimura, Yasutake, nor any combination of the two, describes or suggests forming a hole portion in a center portion of one of the element and opposing substrates. Apparently recognizing this failure, the Examiner indicates that it would be a matter of optimization or design choice to place the hole in the center of a cell when the primary viewing area is near the boundary of the cell. However, this argument is inapplicable to the claimed subject matter in view of the recitation that the substrates are scribed to form multiple liquid crystal devices. In view of the scribing, a hole placed in the center of the substrate would necessarily not be located in the center of at least one of the devices, and this argument would not apply.

Enclosed is a \$1,190 check (\$770 for Request for Continued Examination fee and \$420 for the Petition for Extension of Time fee). Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/17/04


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331